

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 27, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 27, 2004. Claims 9-18, 27-36 and 45-54 are pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 9-18, 27-36 and 45-54 stand rejected by the Examiner. Applicant cancels claims 9-18 without prejudice. The Examiner states that claims 27-36 and 45-54 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 9-36 and 45-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 27, 30, 34, 45, 48, and 52, are amended to clarify the invention. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims 27, 30, 34, 45, 48, and 52, as amended, and the claims dependent thereon, are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference. Claims 9-18 have been cancelled without prejudice by the Applicants. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hatano, et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,709,757. The Examiner asserts that *Hatano, et al.* teaches the method as claimed. Claims 9-11 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to file the cancelled claims in a co-pending application, such as a continuation application. Applicants believe the rejection is moot and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hatano, et al.* in view of any one of *Shrotriya*, U.S. Patent No. 5,843,239 and *Tanaka, et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,039,834. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to conduct the method of *Hatano, et al.* in chambers provide with lines. Claims 12-14 and

16-18 have been cancelled without prejudice by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to file the cancelled claims in a co-pending application, such as a continuation application. Applicants believe the rejection is moot and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)